

Central Intelligence Agency

Counterintelligence
& Security

Washington, D.C. 20505

06 Nov 1986

OLL 85-3096/2

The Honorable Henry J. Hyde
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Hyde:

I read with interest the Allan Goodman article entitled "Keeping Secrets" that you forwarded in your letter of 7 October. I agree with Mr. Goodman that improvements are needed in clearance procedures to minimize the chance that untrustworthy individuals get access to vital secrets. While most of the steps needed in this area are administrative in nature, there is one legislative initiative now being considered by a House/Senate Conference Committee on the FY86 Intelligence Authorization Bill that I believe is important to this effort. This legislative initiative would allow the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Department of Defense (DOD), and Office of Personnel Management (OPM) access to criminal history information from state and local authorities while conducting background investigations. I have urged the Conference Committee to adopt this provision which is contained in the Senate version of the Intelligence Authorization Bill. I hope to have your support on it as well.

There are other administrative steps that must be taken to improve the overall security situation. Mr. Goodman is correct in saying that too many people hold clearances and that the number must be reduced to those with a demonstrated need for access to classified information. Effecting these reductions, however, is extremely difficult to do properly. A "meat cleaver" approach; i.e., arbitrarily cutting by a certain percentage, tends to produce confusion and other undesirable consequences. Instead, a careful and diagnostic approach is called for under which the need-to-know of each clearance holder is carefully weighed and the clearances quickly removed where only marginally justified. At the same time, other initiatives must ensure that information is classified only where necessary to national security. Thus, the twin problems of clearance proliferation and excessive use of classification must be attacked simultaneously and in ways more vigorous and effective than in the past. I am dedicated to the pursuit of these objectives.

Mr. Goodman is also correct in his belief that there are not enough investigators working on the investigative requirements of the Executive Branch. More investigators are needed to keep up with the initial requests for clearances to do the work in a timely and cost-effective way, and to do the equally important reinvestigations needed periodically to revalidate clearances and detect the cleared persons who, over time, have become a security risk.

As to investigative techniques and question formats, the field clearly needs imagination and multiple perspectives. Asking the right questions is the goal. Both security issues, i.e., loyalty, character, trustworthiness, honesty, and suitability issues such as drug use, alcohol use, emotional stability etc., must be covered in order to get the job done. I believe that the Intelligence Community's security directors are all pursuing such comprehensive coverage in their investigative pursuits, but it may be that lack of experience by certain young investigators is undermining the effort. On the chance that this is the case, I will soon be asking my Security Committee, consisting of senior security officials in the Intelligence Community, to study the matter and to see if additional training is needed.

In the CIA, the background investigation is supplemented by a polygraph examination which focuses on the relevant security and suitability issues with the best source of information available to the applicant or candidate for a clearance. This examination produces a reliable profile of an individual and provides data that no investigation, however comprehensive and skillfully done, could ever deliver. Any legislative limitations on the responsible use of the polygraph by the Intelligence Community would significantly weaken security screening procedures. I hope that you will join me in opposing such legislation.

Finally, I am concerned about the possible weakness of the current procedures used generally to produce "Secret" clearances. It may be that additional steps should be taken beyond a national agency check to provide the basis for access to the massive array of sensitive data carried in "Secret" documents. I am planning an Intelligence Committee review of this issue.

The above steps are illustrative of the efforts currently underway to improve personnel security procedures. I believe we know what the problems are and, given time and resources, can deal with them effectively without the formation of a Presidential Commission such as suggested in the Goodman article.

I look forward to working with you in strengthening our security posture.

Sincerely,

/s/ William J. Casey

William J. Casey
Director of Central Intelligence

Distribution:

Original - Addressee

- 1 - DCI
- 1 - DDCI
- 1 - EXDIR
- 1 - ER
- 1 - DDA
- 1 - General Counsel
- 1 - D/OS
- 1 - D/OLL
- 1 - DD/OLL
- 1 - OLL Chrono
- ✓ 1 - Leg/Sub - Counterintelligence & Security
- 1 - DMP Signer

LEG/OLL dmp (29 Oct 1985)

STAT

HENRY J. HYDE
8TH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

COMMITTEES:
JUDICIARY
FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

2104 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-4861

Executive Registry
85-3863

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON
85-3096

October 7, 1985

The Honorable William J. Casey
Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear Bill:

The enclosed article provided a lot to think about and worry over. Would any legislation help? Perhaps your legal department has some ideas.

Cordially,



Henry J. Hyde
Member of Congress

HJH:nsm
Enclosure

Allan E. Goodman

Keeping Secrets

8-15-85
Post

"The current system almost guarantees that investigators won't have time to ferret out spy rings."

"Professor, this won't take even five minutes of your time."

Thus begins most of the U.S. government background information interviews I have given over the past several years on graduating students who have been accepted for federal employment. Since about half of Georgetown's graduates go into the public sector, federal investigators are numerous and frequent visitors to our campus.

Many of these interviews are worthless. The overworked investigator clearly is anxious to move on to the next case—and frequently complains about an impossible workload. The questions appear designed only to discover if the student has demonstrated unstable behavior with respect to the use of drugs or alcohol. The questions are asked in a way that invites non-medical professors to render medical judgments, and this is something that most professors refrain from doing. If a student had the potential to damage U.S. interests the way the Walkers allegedly have, I doubt the current system would uncover it.

Moreover, in my five years as director of Georgetown's School of Foreign

Service graduate program, rarely have I been asked to render judgments about subjects on which I am competent. For example, I never have been asked about a student's integrity—whether he or she has ever been found guilty of academic dishonesty. I never have been asked whether the student gets his or her work done on time. I never have been asked to describe a student's academic strengths and weaknesses.

Most interviews end with what investigators call the catch-all question: "Would you recommend this student for a position of trust and responsibility with the U.S. government?" The question virtually requires an affirmative response unless the student has been found guilty of academic dishonesty or has acknowledged personal problems that would impair his ability to hold a federal government job. In an age when students have the right to see the contents of their security investigation files—a right that I strongly support—we professors have an obligation to respond narrowly to such catch-all questions. Whether or not we like a student or whether we have heard via the student grapevine

that he or she was drunk at a party should not enter into an answer. Thus, the government's apparent purpose in using the "catch-all question"—to fish for derogatory information—is defeated.

Unless this background investigation is changed fundamentally, it will not detect likely problems or warn of potential threats. And by swamping the system with more than a quarter million requests annually for routine background checks of the kind I have described, the current system almost guarantees that investigators won't have the time to ferret out spy rings by conducting enough periodic follow-up investigations of those with access to sensitive national security information.

The recently announced plan by Secretary of the Navy John Lehman to reduce the number of people with access to classified information and to centralize control over the process by which clearances are granted is, in principle, a sensible interim response to a crisis. But how this plan can be executed by a mere 900 naval security investigators with a caseload of more than a million personnel has yet to be explained. And similar plans have not

even been announced to cover Army and Air Force personnel or defense industry employees, who in the past have proven to be equally lucrative targets for KGB recruiters.

Perhaps the worst damage the Walker case has wrought is the revelation that the government's security clearance process is outmoded, understaffed and ineffective. But this is not a new story. The system has been found at fault repeatedly by congressional investigations. Just a month before the Walkers were arrested, the Senate held hearings on federal government security clearance programs that revealed, according to Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), that "the government is already plainly incapable of adequately investigating and reinvestigating all persons seeking security clearances."

Unfortunately, there are no quick, easy or cheap ways to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of this process. So far, the government is going about doing so by administering Band-Aids. Priority should be placed on reducing the number of secrets, for example, as well as the number of people with access to them so the one can

be better protected and the other more thoroughly screened. The problem should be attacked on a government-wide basis, not agency by agency; uniform standards and control procedures should be developed and applied stringently to defense industry contractors as well.

What these issues require is the creativity and expertise of a high-level, bipartisan presidential commission. Protecting our secrets in a better way is now too important a job to be left to already overworked—if not demoralized—offices of security in a dozen agencies. A presidential commission could ease the pain of changing old ways and help infuse the arcane business of security investigations with new ideas. And since the cost of a new security system likely is to be high, the president will need the Democratic as well as Republican political and business leaders who might serve on such a commission to help persuade Congress to foot the bill.

The writer, associate dean of Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, served as presidential briefing coordinator for the Central Intelligence Agency.

H 9648

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 4, 1985

H.R. 1795

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the restriction set forth in the proviso in section 5 of the Act of April 21, 1806 (2 Stat. 401) shall not apply to—

(1) the land conveyed by the Yazoo Mississippi Valley Railroad Company to the City of Natchez by a deed dated June 20, 1945, and recorded on page 177 of deed book 5-J in the records of Adams County in the State of Mississippi; and

(2) the land conveyed by the City of Natchez to Sim C. Callon by a deed dated June 12, 1984, and recorded on page 402 of deed book 16-J in the records of Adams County in the State of Mississippi.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO RELEASE A REVERSIONARY INTEREST IN CERTAIN LANDS IN ORANGE COUNTY, FL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1740) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release a reversionary interest in certain lands in Orange County, FL, which were previously conveyed to Orange County, FL.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1740

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SECTION 1. RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.

(a) RELEASE.—

(1) TO ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, shall release to Orange County in the State of Florida the reversionary interest of the United States contained in the deed described in paragraph (3).

(2) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—The reversionary interest referred to in paragraph (1) is the condition which provides that title to the lands described in the deed shall revert to, and revert in, the United States if the lands cease to be used for recreational purposes or if such lands are deemed to be necessary for national defense.

(3) DEED.—The deed referred to in paragraph (1) is the quitclaim deed dated February 11, 1972, by which the United States conveyed to Orange County, Florida, a site of approximately 1,200 square feet on the Apopka-Vineland Road, formerly used by the United States as a radar site.

(b) CONDITION OF RELEASE.—The Secretary shall release the reversionary interest described in subsection (a)(2) only if Orange County, Florida, agrees to use any proceeds from the sale of the land referred to in subsection (a)(3) for park and recreation purposes (including the construction of buildings and facilities for the storage of equipment and materials used for park and recreation purposes).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, strike "1,200" and insert "12,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bills just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

WHAT COAST-TO-COAST NEWSPAPERS HAVE TO SAY ABOUT GRAMM-RUDMAN

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I had time this weekend to spend going through newspapers in all parts of this country and find out what they had to say about the Gramm-Rudman plan.

I wish I could tell you each part; all I can say is they go from coast to coast; from North to South. What we really find here is that when neutral people on the outside have had time to look at the Gramm-Rudman plan, here are some of the things they have called it.

"A shameful sham: political, fiscal and moral nonsense; a fiscal farce; Mickey-Mousing; a tinker toy; mockery; a public relations gimmick; posturing; risk Abracadabra; a debtor's game; a slap-dash measure; game playing; no-nothing legislation; deception; slickest trick; sheer madness; boomerang"; and on, and on, and on.

Basically it is not a deliberative document dealing with the deficit. Basically, that is what the House alternative is. I hope that people look at these newspaper reviews and study them with great care because we certainly are beginning to see that they are deliberating over this much more than the other body did.

A LOST WEEKEND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I think Congress ought to pay for its own days off.

I am now preparing legislation to assure that the Social Security Trust Fund is repaid every last nickel of interest lost because of this Congress' urge to take a weekend off. I hope I'm not the only person here who feels a responsibility.

Last Friday, faced with a choice of staying here to settle the problem of a national debt ceiling or taking the weekend off, leadership threw open the door of this Chamber over my objections and the objections of virtually every Republican in this House.

The cost of our 2 days' relaxation was \$10 million in lost trust fund interest.

Mr. Speaker, the time I have with my family is priceless. Maybe it is worth \$5 million a day. But this isn't my money, and I don't think anyone in this House has a right to steal from Social Security to pay for our days off.

I urge my colleagues here to join me in legislation which guarantees that Social Security will not lose because of our irresponsibility.

VOTE TO DEAUTHORIZE THE ELK CREEK DAM

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my friends and colleagues if we are really serious about cutting the deficit or whether it is just rhetoric. We are going to have a test on Wednesday in an amendment to H.R. 6, the water projects bill.

A once-valued project, the Elk Creek Dam in Oregon is no longer considered worthwhile by the Corps of Engineers. They think it is a waste of money. Thirty-two million dollars has been appropriated but not spend. It is Gramm-Rudman real dollars sitting there to be saved.

The construction of the dam has not begun. You can vote to save that money and another \$70 million needed later by deauthorizing Elk Creek Dam. Here is what the leading newspaper in Oregon, the usually propublic works Oregonian said:

It is such irresponsible and overvalued projects that have given legitimate western water projects a bad name.

The Oregonian wants to build good projects; they do not want to build this one. Save 32 million real Gramm-Rudman dollars. Vote "yes" to deauthorize the Elk Creek Dam.

LEAK OF ALLEGED CIA PLAN AGAINST COLONEL QADHAFI

(Mr. WORTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, someone has apparently violated the trust placed in them and leaked classified information and materials regarding a plan to destabilize the Libyan Government of Colonel Qadhafi.

Colonel Qadhafi actively supports and sponsors terrorism in other nations and is an aggressor against his neighbors. In my opinion, a plan to combat his activities—even if it means destabilizing his government—would be no more than a justifiable response to the terror, pain, and suffering he has caused in his own nation, the Middle East, and several other countries around the world.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 99th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 131

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1985

No. 150

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Be exalted, O Lord, in Thy strength.
We will sing and praise Thy power.—*
Psalm 21:13.

We admit our weaknesses, O God, and we know our limitations. In this, our prayer, we ask that Your boundless power will encourage us to rise above the common level of life to do those things that give meaning to honor, truth, and justice. Leave us not comfortless but may Your spirit lift us to levels of service to all Your people. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule 1, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3669. An act to prevent the disinvestment of the Social Security Trust Funds and other trust funds.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1210) "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1042), "An Act to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the

House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. EAST, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. HART to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-122)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Friday, November 1, 1985, at page S14683.)

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADAM BENJAMIN, JR., VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OUTPATIENT CLINIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1361) to designate the Veterans' Administration Outpatient Clinic to be located in Crown Point, IN, as the "Adam Benjamin, Junior, Veterans' Administration Outpatient Clinic."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO RELEASE CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS IN A PREVIOUS CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE TOWN OF JEROME, AZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1593) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release on behalf of the United States certain restrictions in a previous conveyance of land to the town of Jerome, AZ.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1593

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior shall release, by quitclaim deed or other good and sufficient instrument, on behalf of the United States, with respect to the land described in subsection (b) which was conveyed by the United States to the town of Jerome, Arizona, by a patent numbered 497804, all conditions on such patent which required that such land be used for cemetery or park purposes.

(b) The land referred to in subsection (a) which was conveyed to the town of Jerome, Arizona, on November 8, 1915, by a patent numbered 497804, is all of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 30, township 16 north, range 3 east of the Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona, containing forty acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTING CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI FROM A RESTRICTION SET FORTH IN THE ACT OF APRIL 21, 1806

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1795) to exempt certain lands in the State of Mississippi from a restriction set forth in the act of April 21, 1806.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

H 9647

November 4, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9649

But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether or not the infamous source provided accurate information, it is extremely disturbing that sensitive policy options cannot be discussed without the possibility—and even the probability—of some disgruntled individual leaking information. This is neither an appropriate nor an honorable way for participants in policy formulation to express their opposition to policy decisions.

The person responsible for the leak should be found and punished. The majority of people with access to sensitive information argue their positions in an honest manner and behave responsibly if, in the end, the policy decision goes against their advice. But a single leaker can jeopardize a policy and the entire system of policy formulation. Without corrective action, the effect could be paralysis. I congratulate the administration on its determination to find the source of the leak.

This incident contributes to serious concerns about the adequacy of the current system of protecting sensitive information. I firmly believe it is time for us to take a long and hard look at this problem and have introduced H.R. 3626, to establish a National Commission on Classified Information and Security Clearance Procedures for this purpose. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and support action on it.

DISINVESTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, the Senate was willing to concur with the House-passed temporary extension of the debt ceiling, a measure which I opposed, on Friday. The Senate attempted to call the House Clerk and the House enrolling clerk at 10 p.m., on Friday to make arrangements to have the extension signed. The Senate was told that there was no one around to enroll the bill or sign it to be sent to the President. Everyone had gone home.

The Senate found a discrepancy in the House bill, cleaned it up, and passed a temporary extension. Because the House had adjourned, Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department proceeded with disinvestment. The process of disinvestment cannot be reversed.

The leadership in this House acted irresponsibly, Mr. Speaker, and allowed the Social Security Trust Fund to be exposed to disinvestment by adjourning and leaving no one here to process the bill from the other body.

There was a near unanimous vote by the Republicans against adjourning the House on Friday. The version of the temporary extension passed by this body was not the version which is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

Mr. Speaker. I refer to the RECORD, page No. H9635.

Mr. Speaker, we were sent here in January to do a job. We have not done it for 10 months. We had an opportunity on Friday and we muffed it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to state that the House is always available to receive messages. The Clerk is within 5 minutes. The Senate has the Clerk's telephone number. That is the normal procedure that has always been followed. There was no dissidence on the part of the House.

Mr. STANG. I thank the Speaker.

GRAMM-RUDMAN STILL DESERVING OF SUPPORT

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, despite the harsh denunciations we have heard earlier, both today and last week, I am rising in support of the Gramm-Rudman plan to reduce the deficit.

Some call it a desperate proposal, and even worse, but, Mr. Speaker, our country is facing desperate circumstances. The deficit currently stands at around \$200 billion, and the Government spends \$2.6 billion every day. I cannot understand how anyone can doubt that the seemingly irresistible force of Federal spending will soon crowd our private savings and investments, sapping the United States of jobs and productivity.

Unlike some of my colleagues, I am not satisfied with the congressional response to this dilemma. According to an optimistic forecast by the Congressional Budget Office, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 would leave the deficit at an obese \$120 billion in fiscal year 1990. We should compare that figure to the \$36 billion in Gramm-Rudman for fiscal year 1990 or the balanced budget it lays out for fiscal year 1991.

Now, of course, we have the Democratic alternative, but the Democratic House alternative basically guarantees its own unconstitutionality. In other words, from that side we have a new theory: If you make it broke, it will never work.

Mr. Speaker, liberals and other naysayers do not want the President to ride shotgun over the deficit, but I am afraid that without him the rampaging legislators in the House and the Senate may rob America of its economic vigor.

HOUSE MAJORITY FAULTED FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISINVESTMENT

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, here it is Monday. We shut this place

down Friday. Most members on the Republican side voted against adjourning because we wanted to give the Senate an opportunity of considering the 5-day debt extension that the House passed. Unfortunately, the House adjourned before the Senate could even take it up on Friday evening, and so the fact that disinvestment of Social Security Trust Funds took place rests on the Democratic majority here in the House of Representatives.

They are the ones who are going to have to explain to the recipients of Social Security all over this country why this loss from the Social Security Trust Funds has been sustained, because had we stayed in session for several hours longer on Friday evening, it is quite likely that the modification made in the bill by the Senate in order to correct some defects in the House version which would have left the extension not at 5 days but perhaps longer would have been corrected. The Senate did that, but, unfortunately, when they sought to find somebody in the House to have them implemented, we were gone, all long gone back around the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate experience, and I hope that we can resolve this difference soon by giving the Members of the House an opportunity of voting up or down on the Gramm-Rudman proposal which will mandate procedures for implementing the reduction of this deficit. I only hope that sooner, rather than later, we will get to that option.

REPUBLICAN CHAMPIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY WELCOMED

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I think that this national financial crisis has brought about one thing, and that is a metamorphosis of the Republican Party to the support of the Social Security system. For the last 5 years, at every bend in the road, whenever Social Security was under attack, and it often was by President Reagan or others, we did not find a willing partner among our Republican colleagues in regard to assuring older Americans that Social Security would be protected.

So I am pleased to note the outstanding vocal support this past few days that has been voiced for the Social Security system which we Democrats have been fighting to create and maintain these past 50 years, and I hope that this new GOP support will be reflected in future actions as we attempt to restore and to maintain this all-important Social Security commitment for all Americans.

H 9650

CC GRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 4, 1985

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make the following statement:

On page H 9635 in the RECORD of Friday, November 1, 1985, the text of the bill, H.R. 3669, as called up in the House, is printed incorrectly. The permanent RECORD will be corrected to indicate the correct text of H.R. 3669, as passed by the House.

Without objection, the Chair would request that H.R. 3669, which was sent to the Senate, also be printed at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 3669

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on November 6, 1985, the public debt limit set forth in subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased by an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to permit the United States to meet its obligations without disinvesting the Social Security Trust Funds or any other trust funds established pursuant to Federal law. No increase under the preceding sentence shall result in a public debt limit in excess of \$1,840,800,000,000.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, November 6, 1985.

MEMORIAL BILLS

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to engage in a colloquy with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for a colloquy on the three memorial bills that are going to be considered today?

Ms. OAKAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, as I read the bills and the reports, your commit-

tee is recommending that these memorials be authorized so that the sponsoring organizations can begin their efforts to secure the necessary funds for the design of the memorials. But, I ask the gentle lady from Ohio if the legislation in any way designates where—what specific location—these memorials will be located?

Ms. OAKAR. The answer to that question is, No. The determination as to which lands might be suitable for the erection of these memorials is a matter for consideration of other committees. We do not intend to direct where these memorials should be erected.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that response. I chair the Subcommittee on National Parks and our subcommittee is very concerned about the proliferation of memorials on national park lands. It is possible that new memorials could encroach on existing memorials or that they could be incompatible with other uses of the limited lands involved.

Furthermore, the maintenance and protection of these memorials places a considerable burden and expense on the administering agency. These are some of the reasons that the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are so concerned with the placement of additional memorials on national park lands. In the months ahead, I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on National Parks can look carefully at this entire problem and that it can develop meaningful legislation to deal with the future placement of memorials on the national park lands.

Again, I appreciate the fact that the House Administration Committee has left the site designation for these memorials open for consideration at a future time by the committees having jurisdiction. As I understand the gentle lady, once the sponsoring organization has secured the funds, it will then seek approval for the design of the memorial by the National Capital Planning Commission. The question of its location may, in fact, require further consideration or legislation. Is that correct?

Ms. OAKAR. Yes. I believe that is correct.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentle lady for yielding and for this opportunity to address this question.

□ 1220

MEMORIAL TO HONOR WOMEN WHO HAVE SERVED IN OR WITH THE ARMED FORCES

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36), authorizing establishment of a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. Res. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEMORIAL

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Women in Military Service for America Memorial Foundation is authorized to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor women who have served in or with the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) SITE, DESIGN, AND PLANS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Foundation shall be responsible for selecting a site for the memorial and preparing the design and plans for the memorial, each of which shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The United States shall not pay any expense of establishment of the memorial. The Foundation shall not begin construction of the memorial until, as determined by the Comptroller General, amounts available to the Foundation from non-Federal sources are sufficient to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 3. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.

The authority to establish the memorial under this resolution shall expire at the end of the five-year period beginning on the date on which this resolution becomes law, unless construction of the memorial begins during that period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to compliment the minority leader of our task force for the work and support that he has done on these memorials, as well as members of our committee, for their unanimous agreement.

Mr. Speaker, in January, I introduced a resolution which will authorize the establishment of a memorial to honor the thousands of women who have served in the Armed Forces. The Federal Government would provide the land in the District of Columbia, while the funding of the memorial itself would come from private services.

Mr. Speaker, women have served in a variety of military occupations in the Armed Forces since the American Revolutionary War where more than 20,000 women served.

Women also experienced combat action in the Civil War. One of the most famous soldiers of that time was Sarah Edwards, who disregarded the customary social mores of the 19th century and performed the functions of a courier, nurse, and soldier. Other women, such as Clara Barton, also made their mark in history tending to the sick and wounded. Clara Barton, as we all know, went on to establish

November 4, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 14721

ering the power that so many died to give them, and all because they are afraid that using it will hurt their chances of being re-elected next year.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the transaction of routine morning business be extended until 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EVANS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COL. J. NORMAN PEASE: BEGINNING HIS 101ST YEAR

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this past Friday, November 1, a distinguished North Carolinian, and a good friend of mine, Col. James Norman Pease, Sr., celebrated his 100th birthday. Colonel Pease founded one of North Carolina's leading engineering firms, J.N. Pease & Associates, in 1938. At the age of 90, he retired from active work at the firm but remains an honorary life director. He continues to come to the office almost daily. He is a registered professional engineer in several States, and is a charter member of the Professional Engineers of North Carolina.

Mr. President, Colonel Pease is a delightful man and, as I said earlier, a treasured friend of mine. Throughout his life, he has generously shared his talents, skills, and resources with others. He served his country in both world wars, distinguishing himself as a colonel in command of the 369th Engineer Regiment during World War II. For his service at Guadalcanal and in the Philippines, he was awarded the Bronze Star for meritorious service.

Colonel Pease is an active and vigorous business and civic leader in the city of Charlotte. He has served on the boards of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, the North Carolina Industrial Development Foundation, the Charlotte Symphony Society, and many others. Currently, he is a member of the advisory board of the Salvation Army, a director of the Cen-

tral Piedmont Community College Foundation, and a board member of the Charlotte Good Fellows Club. He is an elder of Myers Park Presbyterian Church.

Mr. President, I convey my respect and admiration to Colonel Pease as he begins his 101st year. He has served his city, State, and country with distinction. I know the U.S. Senate joins in wishing this respected centenarian many more good years as he begins his second century.

SOME THINGS SHOULD BE SECRET

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this past Sunday's Washington Post had an article on the front page that went into great detail concerning alleged activities by the Central Intelligence Agency in regard to Libya. Their "sources" were not named; "high level sources," I think was used in the article. Also, in today's New York Times, there is a similar article.

I rise today to express my outrage that we evidently have Members in Congress, and we do not know whether it is on the House side or the Senate side, or if they are Members or staff members, who are divulging very sensitive information, whether it be correct or not.

I hope that this matter will be investigated not only by the Justice Department, but also by the Members and appropriate committees in the House and the Senate to find out who is responsible. If it is a Member of the Congress, either on the House side or the Senate side, I would hope that, at the bare minimum, they would be censured, if not expelled, from Congress. If it is a staff member, Mr. President, I would hope that, at a very minimum, they would be dismissed.

Again, I think there are some things that should not be divulged; certainly this is one, and I hope the House and the Senate will take appropriate action to see that further security information is not divulged in this manner.

MIROSLAV MEDVID

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last Friday night the Senator from New Hampshire introduced into the Record an affidavit sworn to by Mrs. Irene Padoch, who was the first interpreter used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in its interview of the Soviet seaman Miroslav Medvid, and in that sworn statement the interpreter, Mrs. Padoch, made it quite clear that, contrary to the INS statement, in her interview with seaman Medvid he asked for political asylum. The INS claims that he did not. She, a contract interpreter for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in a sworn statement says that he did twice ask for political asylum, unequivocally, and further stated his fears of what would be his fate if he were to be returned.

Just this morning, Mr. President, a statement came into my hands—I believe it was issued last Friday, as a matter of fact—on the part of the organization Helsinki Watch, a prestigious and respected organization in this country which looks after human rights particularly in the context of the Helsinki accords. I want to read that statement into the Record:

STATEMENT OF HELSINKI WATCH REGARDING THE CASE OF MR. MIROSLAV MEDVID, NOVEMBER 1, 1985

The Helsinki Watch calls on United States officials to take further action in the case of Miroslav Medvid, the seaman who jumped ship, to assure that he is not returned to the Soviet Union involuntarily, if he has a well founded fear of persecution.

In the view of the Helsinki Watch, the hurried processing of Mr. Medvid did not give him an adequate opportunity to obtain advice about his rights nor to consider in a calm atmosphere the consequences that he might suffer. We urge a delay in which Mr. Medvid would have an opportunity to determine how he wishes to exercise his rights.

The obvious contradiction between Mr. Medvid's behavior when he was forcibly put back on a Soviet freighter and his reported decision subsequently to return to the U.S.S.R. underscores the need for a less hurried consideration of his legal rights.

If Mr. Medvid is returned the United States should receive assurances that the United States Embassy personnel in the U.S.S.R. can see him to ascertain his well being.

The Helsinki Watch is a citizens organization that monitors and promotes compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki Accords in the thirty-five nations that signed them. Its Chairman is Robert L. Bernstein; its Vice-Chairmen are Orville Schell and Aryeh Neier; its Executive Director is Jeri Laber.

Mr. President, so there is yet another statement added to those of many Members of Congress expressing concern about the way in which this case was handled and making the recommendation that the case be reopened, this time from a prestigious organization with an excellent track record in the area of human rights, drawing attention to the distinct difference between Mr. Medvid's behavior, indeed his stated request to the INS interpreter, Mrs. Padoch, that he be given asylum on the one hand, and the opinion and the claim on the part of the INS on the other that he did not seek asylum.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said Friday night. This is a shameful, shocking episode and once again I call upon the administration to once again use the statutory authority by which it boarded that ship in the first place last week and removed Mr. Medvid. It is still there. It was not prejudiced by having been used once. We can use it again fully in accord with our own laws and international treaties as well, particularly the International Law of the Sea Treaty.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues who might hear my remarks in this matter to do all they can, to call the White House and to plead with the

S 14722

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 4, 1985

chief of staff, with the Attorney General, indeed to call the President and to plead with him to reopen this case, that we might give Mr. Medvid a better opportunity to recover from his exhaustion, to recover from the effects of any drugs which might have been administered, to be fully apprised of his rights, to be fully assured that this Government will do all it can to ensure the safety of his family, if he is worried about the safety of his family back home; indeed, their safety might have been threatened, to give this man an opportunity to make a clear-headed and reasoned decision about his future, to give him a chance and, at the same time—and just as important—to clear the Nation's honor, to erase this foul mark against the record of this country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, the odyssey on the farm bill here on the Senate floor merits a clear recording of the matters that are considered in it and the matters that interfere with its consideration.

On Friday, October 25, a number of amendments were accepted. This was really the first day of actual debate. Some amendments were voted upon but were also easily accepted on a voice vote concerning the amendments. That took up Friday.

Then on Monday, we started a procedure of laying down cargo preference amendments and considering them. By unanimous consent, on Wednesday, October 30, the cargo preference amendments were laid aside and the Lugar amendment was taken up. The Lugar amendment was simply to modify the bill to have target prices at the current levels for only 1 year, the so-called 1-year freeze on target prices. We voted on that at 5:20 on that date, last Wednesday, and the proposed amendment was defeated, which put us right back on cargo preference.

The balance of that day was taken up by considering whether or not other amendments would be brought up. When we were taken out and brought back on Thursday, October 31, we were brought back on to the farm bill at 7:36 p.m. with a motion by the majority leader to recommit the bill and adding two of his amendments to that motion of recommitment. We finished out the Halloween evening with a reading of the amendment, not all of it was read, a portion of it was read, and we adjourned.

Friday morning, we went to the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill and we were on it until 3:04 p.m., when we went back on to the farm bill. At 3:21, just a few minutes later, 17 minutes later, the majority leader made a motion to table his own amendment, and the tabling motion did not prevail. After that vote was completed, at 3:51 p.m., we went off the bill and we are still not back on it.

It should be made clear that the reason we are not on it is that the pending business before us is the debt ceiling bill with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendment attached to it. Under the agreement which was entered into by unanimous consent, we would be on that until several amendments are disposed of and final passage is voted, sometime, presumably, on Wednesday evening.

So if we are going to have much debate on the farm bill, I guess it is going to be during the morning hour, because there is no opportunity, in the position we are in, for getting back to the farm bill without regular order being called for, and I would not anticipate that any of us would want to call for regular order since it is clear, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that we are determined to dispose of the debt ceiling and the Gramm-Rudman provision.

The pending amendment, in the form of a motion for recommitment with two of the Dole amendments attached to it, should be properly understood by the Senate. First of all, the Dole amendment calls for a 1-year target price freeze for feedgrains, cotton, and rice.

For wheat, there is a different deal. It is called the flexible parity concept. The wheat farmers, in return for setting various amounts of land aside, would receive deficiency payments from the Treasury for the wheat produced on the remaining part of their farms. This special wheat program works this way: for instance, for setting aside 25 percent of the land, the wheat farmer would have a target price of \$4.60 for the 1986 crop, and \$4.35 for the target price for the succeeding year's crops.

What is the advantage to the wheat farmer? The wheat farmers of a particular size, depending upon their acreage and their production, might be in favor of this program, this so-called flexible parity for wheat.

For instance, if the acreage were quite large you could have a target price of \$5.50, substantially higher than that contemplated by any bill for your production by setting aside 40 percent of your acreage.

Forty percent of the acreage of a small farm might look like some sort of targeting procedure to help a small wheat farmer. I do not think most larger farmers will think it is targeted for small wheat farmers. I think they are going to believe it is targeted for them because they would set aside whatever fits their case. If they can

make more money on the deficiency payments by setting aside 40 percent, they will go for the \$5.50. However, if they make more money by setting aside only 15 percent of their land and make more money getting a \$4.20 target price they will pencil it out and make their own choice.

The National Association of Wheat Growers has reviewed the flexible parity concept for wheat a number of times. They tell me that they still reject it and reject it rather vigorously because they believe that there must be some supply control and that if we are going to target the program for the smaller producers we ought to go at it in a different way. That is what we did in the Senate Agriculture Committee, we did target it for the smaller producers with the Boren amendment which allows for the slightly higher target price for production up to 20,000 bushels and then reduces it for production over that. That is calculated to assist the small wheat producers more than it would the larger wheat producers.

The point is that as far as the National Association of Wheat Growers are concerned, this particular proposal will have some appeal to large wheat producers and perhaps some to small wheat producers misled on the promise that it somehow helps them more than large wheat producers. The National Association of Wheat Producers does not view it that way. They look at it as a mechanism that would increase the supply of wheat at a time when we would like to see the supply decreased that is produced in the 1986-88 crops. Therefore, they view it as detrimental and moving in the wrong direction.

I have said, Mr. President, that the National Association of Wheat Growers has looked at this amendment several times over the past several years. The Senate in fact did pass it in 1978. When we passed it here in the Senate in that year, the House rejected the proposal 2 to 1. I am told that the House managers were encouraged at that time by the author of the flexible parity concept proposal to drop it out of the bill and that resulted in the 2-to-1 vote of rejection by the House.

Nevertheless, it is before us again so we will have the opportunity. I would hope, to review it very much in detail and consult with wheat producers in various States that we represent to see what their particular view is on it now.

Going to the rest of the Dole amendment, there are several points that should be made about the amendment. Some are good and some are bad.

First of all, it picks up a number of savings, that is, savings out of the Treasury and cost of the farm bill over the life of the bill in order to bring it under the budget resolution adopted by the Senate. That is commendable.

Beyond that, there are some concerns. First of all, the concerns of the corn and feed grain people, the rice people, and the cotton people covered